ORIGINAL

BEFORE THE
POSTAL RATE COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20268-0001

RECEIVED

JUL 19 10 OT AM '96

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

Special Services Fees and Classifications) Docket No. MC96-3

OFFICE OF THE CONSUMER ADVOCATE
INTERROGATORIES TO UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE
WITNESS SUSAN W. NEEDHAM
(OCA/USPS-T8-19-27)
(July 19, 1996)

Pursuant to sections 25 and 26 of the Rules of Practice of the Postal Rate Commission, the Office of the Consumer Advocate hereby submits interrogatories and requests for production of documents. Instructions included with OCA Interrogatories 1-4 to the United States Postal Service dated June 19, 1996, are hereby incorporated by reference.

Respectfully submitted,

GAIL WILLETTE

Director

Office of the Consumer Advocate

DAVID RUDERMAN

Attorney

OCA/USPS-T-8-19. Library Reference SSR-108, Registered Mail Survey, indicates that a number of large registered mail users desire and would use an Express Mail overnight registry service. In fact, at least one "desperately wants" this service.

- a. Did the Postal Service consider instituting such a service?
- b. If the Postal Service did consider such a service, please explain why it was rejected.
- c. If this was not considered, please explain why not, especially in light of the Service's concerns about market response and customer satisfaction.

OCA/USPS-T-8-20. Library Reference SSR-108, Registered Mail Survey, indicates that some large registered mail users desire and would use a pickup service in conjunction with registry service.

- a. Did the Postal Service consider instituting such a service?
- b. If the Postal Service did consider such a service, please explain why it was rejected.
- c. If this was not considered, please explain why not, especially in light of the Service's concerns about market response and customer satisfaction.

OCA/USPS-T-8-21. Library Reference SSR-108, Registered Mail Survey, indicates that at least one large registered mail user would like an increase in the maximum amount of insurance available for registered items (\$50,000 was the amount mentioned).

- a. Did the Postal Service consider raising the present \$25,000 limit of insurance?
- b. If the Postal Service did consider raising the limit, please explain why it was rejected.
- c. If this was not considered, please explain why not, especially in light of the Service's concerns about market response and customer satisfaction.

OCA/USPS-T-8-22. Please provide the percentage of certified mail and return receipt mail which is subject to the Private Express Statutes.

OCA/USPS-T-8-23. With reference to return receipt: the mailer puts his name and address on the reverse of the card and fills in the box labeled "3. Article Addressed to:" with the recipient's name and address. If the mailer has checked off box #1, requesting the addressee's address and the addressee has not

moved, does the carrier normally re-enter the full address in box #8 or does he enter "same" or a similar phrase to indicate that the address is the same address as in box #3?

OCA/USPS-T-8-24. What percentage of return receipts which request the addressee's address have actually been forwarded and thus, the return receipt shows an address different from that listed by the sender? If you have no statistics on this, please give your best estimate and explain its basis.

OCA/USPS-T-8-25. What percentage of return receipts which do not request the addressee's address have actually been forwarded and thus, are delivered to an address different from that listed by the sender? If you have no statistics on this, please give your best estimate and explain its basis.

OCA/USPS-T-8-26. You propose to combine two present alternatives of return receipt into one. Under the proposal all return receipt users will be notified if the delivery address is different from the one appearing on the mail piece. At page 86 of your testimony, concerning the rationale for this restructuring of return receipts, you state, "[t]he change would

provide better service to customers who do not request delivery address information" and that this is "a value enhancement over the current basic service option. . . ."

Please explain how better service would be provided or value to the customers would be enhanced taking into account the following:

- a. Ninety-eight percent of regular return receipt customers do not request delivery address information at the time of mailing even though it is presently available. See Table XXIV, p. 84.
- b. Ninety-eight percent of the customers of return receipt would be provided with information that they presumably neither want nor care about (since they did not avail themselves of this option).
- c. These customers would pay a fee 36% higher to receive information which they previously had opted not to receive.

OCA/USPS-T-8-27. Library Reference-SSR-109, Supplemental Materials Relating to Insured Mail Proposal, contains a "Mail Insurance Survey, 1993." This survey shows that a number of Postal Service customers ship high value parcels (e.g., values of \$20,000, \$50,000, and higher) with other carriers. See page 45.

The "comment section" also shows that numerous large customers are requesting that the Postal Service provide higher insurance limits than those proposed in this docket. Maximums frequently mentioned are \$25,000 and \$50,000.

- a. In light of the results of this first survey, how did you determine that limits of \$2,000 to \$5,000 should be the subject of the second survey (Attachment 2)?
- b. Were limits higher than those proposed considered or studied? Please explain why they were rejected. In answering this question, please address the fact that UPS and Federal Express offer insurance up to \$50,000. See USPS-T-2 at 6.

1 .---

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this date served the foregoing document upon all participants of record in this proceeding in accordance with section 3.B(3) of the special rules of practice.

DAVID RUDERMAN Attorney

Washington, D.C. 20268-0001 July 19, 1996